

An Essay  
— on —

The necessity of a general therapeutic principle.

— Illustrated by —

The treatment of Asiatic Cholera.

Respectfully Submitted

— To —

The Faculty

— of the —

Homoeopathic

Medical

College

— Pennsylvania. —

For the degree of Doctor of Medicine

— By —

William James Blake

Philadelphia, Feb 1st 1861.

& Pittsburgh, Pa



The necessity of a General Therapeutic Principle  
Illustrated by  
The treatment of Asiatic Cholera.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the subject I have chosen for my thesis, I desire, briefly and cursorily, to glance at the doctrines which, at various times, have claimed the attention of the medical world, inasmuch as I believe they will not only show the inconsistency of Allopathy and its votaries, but will also materially aid me in proving the necessity of a fixed and unvarying law in medicine.

As health is the greatest of all blessings that man can enjoy, the art of preserving it, and restoring it when impaired by disease, must, indeed, be the first and most useful of arts. In reflecting upon the history of the infancy of science, we will naturally conclude that instinct, guided by nature and gradually aided by experience, was the first physician. The



sick were brought forth from their houses and exposed in the temples, and the citizens ushered in the labors of the day by hospitable visits to the inmates of these sacred asylums. Persons who had been afflicted with diseases similar to those under which the objects of their care were suffering, administered to them the remedies which had proved beneficial in their own cases. Thus one profited by the experience of another; while this lively sympathy, this fraternal attention and untiring zeal for the relief of their suffering brethren, so charms and attracts us, that we are, instinctively, drawn in spirit towards this remote period, and regretfully sigh for the loss of a custom so philanthropic, so truly noble. Happy age! in which physical frugality, with moral purity of life, extended the happy and healthful state of man to the fullness of the period allotted by Nature, and left to that wise Mother all the



energy required to combat, successfully, the various forms of disease. But civilization and advancement multiplied the wants and passions of men. They abandoned the simple habits in which they had been reared, and allowed luxury and vice to reign where, before, had been nothing but moral rectitude and purity. Hence diseases multiplied and men felt the want of a more systematic method of treatment. Primitive medicine was abandoned, and, in its stead, systems founded upon plausible, but untenable, hypotheses were adopted. The priests subsequently, appropriated this science for their own aggrandizement, and enshrouding it with the mantle of religion, veiled it in mystery and superstition. Hippocrates, who has been styled the "father of medicine," wrested it from them, and, indeed, considerably improved it, for having versed



himself in the legendary lore extracted from the store-house of tradition, he submitted it to the test of reasoning, and selecting those theories only which appeared to him tenable, he founded upon them his system of medicine. When we consider that Science, in its various departments, since the time of this great man, has moved with gigantic steps towards perfection, we would naturally conclude that medicine had been greatly improved. But, alas! it is not so, and there is not now in Allopathy, even the order and simplicity which existed in the time of Hippocrates. The treatment adopted by the votaries of this system, in the various diseases to which man is heir, has ever been unscientific and unsettled. Based upon theories, unstable as fluting, their system of therapeutics, if system indeed it can be called, has ever been



changing and vacillating. Year after year produces upon the medical stage new advocates of new doctrines, each differing from and denouncing its predecessor, each in turn to be, alike, denounced by its successor, until facts have become as strangers in the temple of Allopathy, and theory, were it not for the youthful Munich which sprang full-armed from the brain of Hahnemann, would become the grave of Medicine.

It would be amusing, were it not padden-  
ing, to pass in review before us the many and  
varied theories in medicine which, at differ-  
ent times, have been given to the world;  
to behold the discrepancies which existed in  
the writings and teachings of the saviors of  
ancient medicine, to see the eager devotion with  
which those teachings were followed by hosts  
of admiring disciples, ever singing the praises  
of their Masters, ever depending, semis oclis que,



their respective speculations, and voicing eternal opposition to everyone differing from them. Yes, we might well smile were this all; but when we look back over the dark vista of the past, and behold the desolating results of those doctrines, does it not seem that Cicero's remark, "Imbecillior est medicina quam morbus," might be justly applied to them. If we thus review the science of medicine, with the many alterations and improvements made during the last two centuries, the medical records of this period will present to us a series of learned and labored dissertations by authors whose names, alone, are now remembered, while their writings force upon us the saddening conviction, that they have but heaped error upon error, system upon system, each one, in turn, yielding to another. But happy, indeed, had it been for mankind if inability and inconsistency were all with which there were



chargable. But the evil has not been confined to this: they have given rise to serious errors in practice, and the loss of millions of valuable lives has been the result. The science of medicine has been clothed in speculative theories from its inception down to the present day, its texture varying with the opinions of different ages, at one time more refined, at another coarse and material. System after system has arisen, flourished and fallen, until their ruins constitute a chaos from which scarce one indisputable fact can be obtained. Whatever may have been the respective virtues of the theories of these authors, uncertainty should be the motto inscribed upon the banners of them all, for having no infallible law for their guidance, they were tossed about upon the dark waters of chance, with no haven wherein to moor their weary bars, no beacon, casting afar its welcome light, to guide them into the



longed for port.

The "Physiological School", among all the doctrines of modern Allopathy, has appeared most prominently. Broussais, who was its head, clung tenaciously to the doctrine of "Inflammation", and, true to his theory, bled and purged his patient in order to reduce the system. Broussais recognized but one disease, "Diathesis", and contended that all abnormal conditions of the system consisted, merely, in an excess or diminution of the vital principle which he fixed at an arbitrary standard. These two conditions he termed "Synergia" and "Dyschemia" or "Synergia" and "Asthene" diathesis, and, in accordance with his doctrine of "Irritability and Depression", sought to stimulate the organism by means of food, Alcohol, Opium &c, or to depress it by opposite means as the case might be. Doctrines which led to such conclusions could not have been correct, and hence we are not



surprised at the irregularities which existed in therapeutics, and which prevailed to the exclusion of rational treatment.

Arranged against these is the "Expectant school", which contents itself with merely observing the progress of the disease and removing deranging influences, without prescribing active medicines, and which consists, in fact, in leaving the disease almost entirely to the efforts of nature. This, though perhaps preferable to the two former, is not sufficient for the cure of disease, for it has been found, that when compared with homoeopathy its ratio of mortality has been much larger than that of the latter.

Richat, in his general Anatomy, says: "Medicine is an incoherent assemblage of incoherent ideas, and is, perhaps, of all the physiological sciences, that which best shows the caprice of the human



mind. What did I say? It is not a science for a methodical mind. It is a shapeless assemblage of inaccurate ideas, of observations often puerile, of deceptive remedies, and of formulae as fantastically conceived as they are tediously arranged.

In the "British Medical and Surgical Journal," Dr J. W. Whiting says: "The very principles upon which most of what are called the theories involving Medical Questions, have been based, were never established. They are and always were false, and, consequently, the superstructures built upon them were as the baseless fabric of a vision - transient in their existence, passing away upon the introduction of new doctrines and hypotheses, like dew before the morning sun." We have seen the truth of these statements; let us pursue the subject still farther, and examine whether discrepancies exist in practice as well as in



theory.

For this purpose I will now proceed to notice the opinions of various allopathic physicians upon their most important remedial Agents, and amongst these Blood-Letting stands preeminent.

Prof. Clutterbuck says of this measure: "Blood-Letting is, unquestionably, the best, because the most effective remedy we possess, in the treatment of idiopathic fever as well as in inflammation in general."

Prof. Paine declares, that, "For inflammation and congestion blood-letting is known to be the most effective remedy," and

Prof. L. Morehead says, that, "For inflammation when seated in the serous tissues, free and energetic blood-letting is entitled emphatically to the name of the remedy." In opposition to these opinions, I will now produce the testimony of physicians of equally high standing with those



above quoted.

Prof. J. S. Sobolew, speaking on this subject, says:

"So far from blood-letting being beneficial, it is productive of the most serious and fatal effects - a cruel practice - a scourge to humanity. How many thousands of our fellow-citizens are sent by it to an untimely grave. He who takes blood from the patient, takes away not only an organ of life, but a part of life itself.

An eminent physician has said that, "After the practice of blood-letting was introduced by Sydenham, during the course of one hundred years, more died of the lancet alone, than all who, in the same period, had perished by war." Prof. Macintosh declares that, "No physician however wise and experienced, can tell what quantity of blood ought to be taken in any given case."



Of Opium, Prof. Hannon says: "Preeminently endowed with the most diversified therapeutic powers, and more extensively used in its various preparations than, perhaps, any other single article in the Materia Medica, this great drug requires at our hands a careful and extended inquiry into its preparations, composition, modes of administration, practical uses and morbid effects." Prof. Eberle calls Opium "a treacherous palliative," & Prof. J. A. Gallup says of it: "It is probable that for forty years past, Opium and its preparations have done seven times the injury that they have rendered benefit on the great scale of the Civilized world."

I am now kept to that remedy considered by the Allopathic faculty, "as the most effective in the treatment of disease" within the compass of their knowledge. I allude to Mercury. Hannon says of this drug: When we declare that



its powers are unique and univalled, we only  
embody the general testimony of the profession  
in its favor."

Hooper remarks that, "There is scarcely a disease  
in which mercury, in some of its forms, is not  
exhibited?" and

Miller corroborates this by saying that, "From  
its power of at once limiting or removing effusions,  
it is very plain, how valuable must be its ad-  
ministration in all inflammatory affections of  
important internal organs."

Prof Golphui regards Mercury as "A perturbatory  
and empirical remedy, which by its stimulant  
property deranges the vital and organic forces."

Harrison declares that, "When we produce a mercurial  
emersion to cure fever, we substitute the  
action of the remedy for that of the disease."

Dr. Murray calls Mercury a tonic; Voight terms it an  
alterative pedative resolvent; Sundelin a  
liquefacient. Hunter accounts for its action by saying:



that, "It produces a different action from that of the disease."

Who does not feel degraded at the humiliating spectacle of glaring inconsistencies which is here presented to us! From the quotations I have made we see that the ablest Allopathic professors are not even united as to the effects of their most important remedies. The lancet they declare to be the "sheet-anchor" of their practice, Mercury the "great Anti-febrile Alterant," and Opium the "Magnum Dei donum" for the cure of disease; and yet they acknowledge that to these same agents may be ascribed the destruction of more lives, than can be attributed to war, famine or pestilence. How are we to reconcile such contradictory statements? Must we adopt one of them, and if so, which? Or must we come to the saddening conclusion, that the great science of medicine, whose ennobling prerogatives



it is to preserve that life which only God can give,  
is still one vast chaos of uncertainty, veiled in  
impenetrable mystery? Cicero has truly said:  
"Hominis ad deos nulla se proprius accedunt, quam  
salutem nominibus dando", but what satisfac-  
tion can he have, who attempts to assuage  
the ailments of his suffering brother with  
remedies of whose effects he, himself, is ignorant?  
Will not the conscientious Allopath see the  
weariness of the system he has adopted?  
Can he not perceive the fatal worm at its  
root which is gnawing and blasting the  
beauty of the tree? It must be evident to him  
that his system has no foundation in fact,  
that it has ever been changing, and that the  
theories which have been promulgated have  
satisfied only until some "new reading of an  
oft repeated tale" has caused their entire  
abandonment.



Demia, in his *Matena Medica*, speaking of the "incomprehensible relation" existing between certain drugs and diseases says: "But though the connection is thus mysterious, (for I do not admit the various hypotheses which have been formed to account for it) we are not to conclude that it is necessarily more intimate than that which exists in ordinary cases."

It is here asserted that the relation existing between drugs and diseases is mysterious and inscrutable, and we may, therefore, infer that empiricism is our only resource. But can it be that between medicine and disease there is no known connection, or that the principle upon which depends the application of drugs to morbid phenomena is beyond the compass of the human mind or that it is to be determined only by the varied workings of chance?

The heavenly bodies moving in their orbits are  
in perfect harmony; the earth ever follows  
the same course through an infinity of space;  
the laws of gravitation are fixed and immu-  
table, while nothing better evidences the  
existence of positive laws than the workings  
of the human organism. Every department  
of science is subsumed to particular governing  
principles, and why should medicine be  
excepted. True, these laws were not always  
known. For generations man had observed  
the changes of the moon, and had ascri-  
bed to it an almost unlimited influence  
in the destinies of this world. But Newton,  
concentrating the powers of his mighty intellect  
upon the philosophy of motion, revealed to  
us the nature of the force, which, afterwards,  
expanding under the mighty resources of his  
great mind, gave us a more beautiful  
solution of the mazy masses floating above,



than that of the pendant stairways of ascending  
Peri's returning to paradise; which still widen-  
ing under his research into a most compre-  
hensive and positive law, embraced in its  
provisions the silent dew, the pleasant  
showers, the swelling tide, the mighty hur-  
ricane, until reaching upward in its  
course it gave to majestic planets, with  
their countless myriads of stars, a more  
definite motion than that of mightily  
sailing onward upon the mighty ocean of  
space to break their noiseless waves upon  
its unknown shore. Bacon and Machiavelli,  
two Master Minds of the sixteenth century, in-  
roving over the vast domain of Science, dis-  
covered that unseen and eternal powers,  
like Homer's divinities at the siege of Troy,  
are ever mingling in sublunary affairs.  
Can it be that the unseen and eternal  
powers faithfully guard every department

of human science except that which concerns  
the best interest of man in this life: the preser-  
vation of his health? Is it possible that God  
has placed inferior objects beyond the  
danger of error, and left, a victim of chance,  
His most perfect creature, him whom He  
made to His own image and likeness?  
Such an admission would be destructive of  
the very idea of Providence, and would  
falsify the sacred words which God  
has spoken to us by the mouths of his  
prophets and Chosen Apostles. But so  
far from this being true, the sacred volume,  
and even nature itself, in all its varied  
movements, emphatically, tells us that  
man is the special object of God's care.  
This then being so we cannot doubt his having  
established an infallible law regulating  
the application of drugs to disease.



Having made the foregoing general remarks, I will now proceed more particularly to the consideration of my subject, viz "The necessity of a general therapeutic principle, illustrated by the treatment of Asiatic Cholera," and although I believe such a law to be universal in its application, still I consider that in the treatment of no disease has it ever been more required than in that of the Cholera, and I have, therefore, considered it as particularly adapted to illustrate and prove the necessity of a principle in medicine which, in its application, shall be both universal and infallible. It is a well known fact, also, that when any hitherto unknown disease appears, the physicians of the Allopathic System are perfectly ignorant of its rational treatment, and in no instance was this fact more fully illustrated than at the time of the first appearance of Cholera in Europe.

I propose, therefore, to show

1st -- The discrepancies which exist in the writings of Allopathic Authors as to the Etiology, pathology and treatment of this disease.

2ndly That these differences, and their consequences, imperatively proclaim the necessity of a fixed law in Medicine.

3rdly - That such a law does exist; that it is "Similia Similibus Curantur," and that the Homoeopathic treatment of the Cholera proves its success.

Long before this dreadful disease appeared in Europe, it had ravaged with devious, but too fatal, course every country from the straits of Malacca to the Pas de Calais. In Hindostan, and other provinces of the British in India, it had raged for fourteen years with unrelenting violence, and thousands had been numbered as its



victims. In vain had the surgeons in the East endeavored to check its progress; in vain had they published pamphlets describing its cause, nature and seat, and proposing measures for its prevention and cure; nothing could stop it, but onward it went in its irresistible course, like the Angel in the camp of Sennacherib, leaving nothing but death and desolation behind it.

"Nothing but lamentable sounds was heard,  
Nor aught was seen but ghastly views of death—  
Infectious Horror ran from face to face,  
And pale despair".

Previous to the advent of the Cholera upon their shores, the English physicians had scornfully rejected all methods of treatment, not originating with themselves. The Editor of the "Medico-Chirurgical Review" in commenting upon an offer of twenty five thousand rubles, made by the

Aulocrat of all the Russias, for the best essay on Cholera, says: "He venture to predict that not an iota of additional information to the stores on hand will be thus elicited," and puerily adds: "What is to be gained by the Russian Government from the best essay on Cholera? The loss of the above sum that's all." It may be here observed that this spirit of self sufficiency was not of long duration; the thousands of patients dying under <sup>their</sup> care, wrong from them the humiliating avowal, that they were totally ignorant of the proper treatment of Cholera, and made them eager to receive suggestions from any source, except alas! from that which, alone, could have assisted them, but which in their pride and ignorance they stigmatized as, "the offspring of a wild and absurd fancy."



Mr. Andral, in his lectures on the Cholera, classed it with the enteric diseases, and recommended as the most effective remedial measures, "free bleeding among the young and vigorous, and plenty of laudanum internally;" and in criticising the treatment adopted by the English physicians, he says: "Physicians in India dose the choleric patients with a draught composed of brandy, rum, pimento camphor &c, which, I must confess, is little better than a saure qui peut remedy".

Mr. Broussais, the learned professor at the Val de Grace, in a series of lectures which he delivered upon this subject, says that, "he considers the disease as varying in its phenomena according to three different portions of the alimentary canal on which it happens to make its first impression; the first extending from the mouth to the termination of the duodenum; the second

conspiring of the small - and the thick of the large intestine". He has, therefore, pronounced it to be, "a highly inflammatory action of the whole alimentary canal", and recommends as the best treatment, "ice ad libitum, leeches to the epigastrium and heat to the extremities". We have here presented to us a remarkable difference in the treatment of two of the most distinguished physicians of Paris: Audral, regarding bleeding and Opium as the great specifics, while Broussais - who, it will be observed, brings his favorite theory to bear upon the disease - places his reliance upon ice internally, leeches and heat externally. Some physicians supposed the brain and spinal marrow to be the original seats of Cholera, others the semilunar ganglia and solar plexus, while a third class referred it to the heart.



Baron Dupuytren differed from them, and also from Andral and Broussais. In his essay upon the subject he says: "I have, uniformly, found the glands of Teyer and Brunner exceedingly enlarged, and yet without any very distinct signs of inflammation. I would, therefore, say that the Cholera has its seat in the alimentary canal in general; and more particularly in the follicles of the small intestine; and that it essentially consists in a secretory irritation of these organs." He recommends, "leeches to the pained part of the belly, plumbi acetar, and a decoction of poppy-heads", declaring that, in his experience, the usual preparations of Opium have been totally useless. He introduces steam beneath the bed clothes, for the purpose of bringing warmth to the surface, and positively discourages

the use of "all purgatives, emetics and irritants, which have been so perniciously ordered by many".

The Baron's theory appears to me to be incorrect in several points. He does not believe that any material difference exists between the epidemic and the common Cholera Morbus, and yet he excludes the liver from having any share in causing the former, while it is well known that it is intimately involved in the latter, as the bilious defections plainly prove. In accounting for the liquid stools, he directs his attention solely to the mucous follicles on the surface of the intestines, and omits any allusion to the exhalant vessels, although the capabilities of the latter for producing such stools are much greater than those of the mucous follicles. The professor, likewise, lays great stress upon the



fact, that, in Cholera, the glands of Teyer and Brunner become much enlarged, but every intelligent physician well knows, that this circumstance has been so frequently observed in post-mortem examinations of the bodies of those who had died of Typhus, that Broussais proposed to form of them a distinct class, and to designate them by the name of "dothienterites." Altogether, Baron Hlopnytsin's explanation of the Cholera appears to me to be neither logical or correct, and his treatment - no better than that recommended by those already noticed.

Mr. Ochel, of St Petersburg, in a letter on Cholera, contends that the proximate cause of the disease is, "a paralysis of the organ of circulation", and says that, "the correct mode of treating Cholera is to evacuate the bile as quickly as possible;"

and that "whatever tends to check the vomiting and purging, before this effect is produced, is decidedly pernicious; for though death may be prevented at the outset of the disease, the foundation is almost always laid for the secondary disease, or stadium reactionis, which never takes place when the bile has been fully discharged in the first stage." His treatment consists in repeated doses of Common salt in tepid water, till it produces bilious vomiting and liquid stools.

This doctrine differs in toto from that of Dupuytren just quoted, for while he absolutely ignores the action of the liver, and declares the disease to consist in a secretory irritation of the follicles of the small intestine, Oehl considers paralysis of the heart to be the exciting cause, and aims to produce



bilious vomiting and liquid stools by means of emetics and Cathartics, which, of all remedial agents, the Baron most condemns. In the Etiology, pathology and treatment of these four antiquished physicians, we cannot discover the slightest shadow of agreement; each differs from the rest, and one denounces in unmeasured terms what another declares to be most useful.

M. Pacamier differs from both Broussais and Dupuytren, in recommending the cold affusion as a stimulant, and in asserting that "this method has had better effects in restoring warmth and circulation than frictions and external heat," which were the measures used by those physicians. It possibly never occurred to the good M. Pacamier that, in restoring the warmth of the body by means of cold affusions, he was treating his patients homoeopathically!

Had any one ventured the suggestion of such an idea he would, no doubt, have ignored it as ridiculous.

The treatment adopted by the English physicians was as discrepant and unpetited as that of their Continental brethren. Each one had his theory, and each claimed that his remedies had been entirely successful. Venesection was, at one time, so lauded, that the Government ordered its adoption; sweating was, afterwards, equally praised, and physicians, in their zeal to produce apparatus which would cause perspiration, turned their attention to mechanics and became inventors. Of internal remedies, Calomel and Opium were in great repute, until they were superseded by Rhubarb and Magnesia, which in their turn yielded to sub-nitrate of bismuth, for a long time considered the specific par excellence. Each country, where the disease appeared, had its own



remedies, which, though differing widely from all others, were still claimed to be the best, as, for instance, Sub-nitrate of bismuth in Russia; Colomel, Opium and bleeding in India. Hence we find Agents entirely opposite in their effects, used in the same affection, as bleeding and transfusion, Heat applied in every form as well as the cold affusions, drinks altogether denied or ordered in unlimited quantities, both Hot and Cold. Enormous doses of Opium were prescribed for the purpose of restraining vomiting and purging, while the same were encouraged by means of emetics and cathartics. Well might a distinguished physician (Dr Smith) say, that "We cannot force, indiscriminately, into practice, agents so opposite to each other in their effects, without feeling that we are abandoning the laws of Scientific Medicine, and plunging into a

chaos of empiricism where the light of pathological reasoning never entered." What a melancholy satisfaction must not Allopathic physicians have, when they read the following avowals made by two of the most distinguished physicians of their school! When they ridicule the practice of their Homoeopathic brethren, with what pride can they not point to the success of their treatment of the Cholera, as an indisputable indication that their system (?) of therapeutics is the only true one! And when in want of proof wherewith to convince dissenters, let them exultingly refer them to the brilliant records of the Cholera of 1830, as a final and undeniable indication of the truth of Allopathy. Sir Mr. Crockett, in his letter on Cholera, says: "It is a most melancholy confession, but one not the less true, that after the Cholera has spread



its devastations from Ceylon to Archangel, from  
Orenburg to Berlin, we are almost as far  
from a rational *Methodus Medendi*, as we were  
when it first appeared on the banks of the  
Ganges; and the Editor of the "*Medico-Chirurg-  
ical Review*", writing after the departure of the  
disease from England, says: "Amidst the vari-  
ety of remedies presented to our notice, we  
feel like a hungry guest with a splendid  
bill of fare - each article tempts, but which  
shall we prefer? Gentlemen are at liberty  
to publish their miracles, and the faithful  
are at liberty to believe them. For ourselves what  
shall we say? Alas, we must own that we are gloomy  
heartily sceptics, without so much as a grain of  
faith, or one single saving particle of belief.  
Would that we could even so much as imagine  
that Cholera has been, is, or will be cured by  
the thousand and one plans of happy memory,  
already published, publishing or to be published.

Caribonari that we are, we do not believe a word of it. In point of fact, we think no better mode of treating Cholera now than when it first appeared in the island, and the really severe cases are just as fatal as they have ever been." Allopathic writers condemn their system, and rail against the treatment adopted by its members, as irrational and useless, but why do they not endeavor to discover some means by which they can render it rational? The reason is evident. There is but one way by which they could make their treatment successful, and that their pride will not allow them to adopt. I have arraigned before the bar of truth and justice, the most eminent among them, and they have admitted, ay, even voluntarily asserted, that their treatment of Cholera was not only unsuccessful but absolutely useless; in the quotations I have made from their writings it is plainly shown, that it was conducted upon no principle, but proceeded



merely from the fancy or prejudice of its Authors.  
Therefore, while I have shown "the discrepancies  
which have existed in the writings of Allopathic  
physicians in regard to the Etiology, Pathology,  
and treatment of the Cholera", I feel justified in  
asserting that, "these differences and their con-  
sequences imperatively proclaim the necessity  
of a fixed law in medicine".

Having, I think,  
satisfactorily, demonstrated my first two prop-  
ositions, I will proceed to the consideration of  
the third and last, viz:

"That such a law does exist;  
that it is *Similia Similibus Curantur*," and  
that the Homoeopathic treatment of Cholera  
proves its success."

"It is an element of the properties  
of the vital principle, that they possess an  
inherent tendency to return from their morbid  
to their natural states. The object of art in

the treatment of disease, is to place those properties in a condition which will enable them most readily to obey this natural tendency. By this method, therefore, we forcibly institute those new pathological conditions which are most conducive to the salutary efforts of Nature (Paine). As has been observed in another part of this essay, the most prominent doctrines of Allopathy are, the Physiological or Active, and the Expectant; the votaries of the latter contenting themselves with merely watching the progress of the disease, and leaving to Nature the performance of the cure; while the former endeavor to excite, in the system, a new or artificial disease, in opposition to the old, or natural, one which they wish to remove. Seeing, therefore, that to cure a disease, it is necessary to institute a new or artificial one, it becomes us to consider and discover what relationship should exist between these two conditions.



If it be always uniform and unvarying, then must we admit the existence of a General Law in Medicine; but if, on the contrary, it be different under different circumstances, then no such law exists. Moreover, if the new disease be directly opposed to the old one, then the relation existing between them is correctly expressed by the maxim "Contraria Contrariis Curantur"; but if the new disease be similar or like to the old one, then must it be expressed by "Similia Similibus Curantur". Now, then, let us see which of the two medical schools, sailing under these respective banners, will give us the best indication of this General Law. The principle of the Allopathic School is that, "The Artificial Disease must be different in kind or location, from that to be overcome;" that, "it should sometimes be an opposite, sometimes a similar only differently located, and sometimes of a non-descript Character, such as may excite a

favorable reaction, by a general and decisive impression upon the forces of life."

Now we know, that in the vast majority of cases it would be impossible to determine what pathological condition would be the exact opposite of the existing disease; and still more impossible to institute a condition of a non-descript character, for in attempting to excite such conditions there is generally, done more harm than good. In reviewing the whole history of medicine, as embodied in Allopathy, we find no indication of a general law of cure; no principle defining the connection which should exist between the natural disease and that to be instituted by art; and it is, at the present time, considered, by all outside our own school, that no such law does, or can, exist, being contrary to Nature itself.



Seeing, then, that Allopathy affords us no clue to a solution of our question, let us enquire of the Homoeopathic school, what should be the relationship existing between the Artificial and Natural Diseases: "The pathological condition to be instituted by art, must always be similar, in kind and location, to the natural, existing disease". Such is our answer, and it is, I assert, the only true one we can receive. The truest test of the infallibility of a law is: its establishing a definite relation between phenomena not hitherto observed; such a one, in short, as will meet, for all time, the requirements of every circumstance coming within its range. Such a one, for instance, is the law of Gravitation, by which the Astronomer can portend the movements of the heavenly bodies at any given time. Such a one is the law of Hahnemann, which has not only established a definite relationship between drugs which have been proved and



and diseases with which we are acquainted, but  
between all remedial agents yet to be discovered,  
and all the morbid phenomena which  
may hereafter occur in the human organism.

I, therefore, conclude - and  
I trust I have clearly shown it - that there,  
most undoubtedly, does exist "A General  
Therapeutic Principle", a fixed law in medicine  
whereby the treatment of disease is to be regulated,  
and that it is the only one which does, or can,  
exist; and furthermore, that this law is the  
one which Hahnemann discovered, and which  
he promulgated under the formula "*Similia  
Similibus Curantur*".

While the Cholera was  
proceeding in its devastating course, and was  
still blasting by its blighting influence the  
fairest portions of the East, and numbering  
thousands among its victims, and while the  
ablest physicians all over the world were



proclaiming their peculiar theories, and recommending their heterogeneous and inconsistent modes of treatment, the great Sage of Cuthen, quietly remaining in his secluded home, took, from the various reports which had reached him, the symptoms of the disease, and applying to them his infallible law, named as the most important remedies in its treatment, Camphor, Cuprum, and Veratrum. He, who had never seen a case of Cholera, gave to a suffering humanity the agents which, ever since, have proved most efficacious in its treatment, and which are, now, not only used by his disciples, but by Allopathic physicians all over the world. What greater, more convincing proof could we have of the truth of his law? Most assuredly none!

Hahnemann did not prescribe these remedies as the Quack does, who when any interests



unknown disease appears, asserts that he can  
cure it, but he prescribes them in accordance  
with a great principle which he had discovered,  
and their success proves not only the truth  
and infallibility of his law, but also that  
which I, before, asserted, that this law  
applies not only to known diseases, but to all  
which may, in time, appear. I hope I have clearly  
and satisfactorily proved all my propositions;  
To myself, perhaps from a too partial view of  
the subject, it appears that I have done so, but  
if not, then I would only say, that it proceeds  
not from their falsity, but from my inability  
to prove their truth.

Wilmington, N. York

February 1<sup>st</sup>

1866.